

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of 07/06/2004 has been carefully reviewed.

The Examiner's rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 112 is deemed overcome by the amendments herein.

The Examiner has then rejected Claim 1 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boone" and has also rejected Claim 1 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone." These rejections are traversed in view of the amendment and arguments herein.

Although there are similarities between applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed and the prior art as evidenced by Boone, there are also significant differences. By way of example, applicant's device is fabricated of two similarly configured side pieces and two similarly configured cross pieces readily adapted to be separated and coupled by the user. In contrast to this, the prior art requires six pieces in the closest embodiment, that of Figure 10. Beyond this, the structural differences are such as to render applicant's device a significant improvement over the prior art. Further, applicant's device includes large circular apertures 28 at the top of the support holders and small circular apertures 30 at an intermediate extent of the support holders. It is not seen that

Applicant: GOTTESMAN, ELAINE

the prior art, including Boone, has any such holes whatsoever, let alone the large holes above and the small holes below.

Further, there is no disclosure of the removable coupling between the cross bars and the support holders as in applicant's device.

This allows applicant's device to be readily used with the spindles of a fixed axial length or spindles of variable axial lengths as is required in Boone.

All in all, the differences in structure and function between applicant's device and the prior art as evidenced by Boone are such that a closer reading of the prior art, including Boone, makes it clear that applicant's invention is new and useful and unobvious.

Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.